

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/009,262	10/009,262 12/10/2001		Peder Nafstadius	P170US00	8158	
466	7590	02/04/2005		EXAMINER		
YOUNG & 745 SOUTH	=		KAO, CHIH CHENG G			
2ND FLOO		TOD I	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ARLINGTO	N, VA 2	22202	2882	<u>-</u>		

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
	Office Antique Occ	10/009	9,262	NAFSTADIUS, P	NAFSTADIUS, PEDER			
	Office Action Summary	Exami	ner	Art Unit				
			heng Glen Kao	2882				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communica Reply	ation appears on	the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress			
THE MA - Extensic after SI) - If the pe - If NO pe - Failure t Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of the Golden of the community of	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ication. Jays, a reply within the ory period will apply ar I, by statute, cause the	o event, however, may a i statutory minimum of thir id will expire SIX (6) MON application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered time ITHS from the mailing date of this of 3ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.			
Status								
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed	on 10 January 2	2005.					
·	• •)⊠ This action i						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition	of Claims							
4a 5)⊠ C 6)⊠ C 7)⊠ C	laim(s) <u>21-23 and 26-39</u> is/are pendir) Of the above claim(s) is/are laim(s) <u>21-23,26-28 and 31-39</u> is/are laim(s) <u>29</u> is/are rejected. laim(s) <u>30</u> is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from allowed.	consideration.					
Application	Papers							
10)⊠ Th Ap Re	e specification is objected to by the E e drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2004 is/oplicant may not request that any objection eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the e oath or declaration is objected to be	are: a)⊠ accepon to the drawing(see correction is req	s) be held in abeyan uired if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 C	• •			
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Ac a)□ 1. 2.	knowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority do Certified copies of the priority do Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have b cuments have b the priority docu I Bureau (PCT F	een received. een received in A ments have been Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)								
2) Notice of 3) Informati	f References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO- o(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTC 	O-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Sweden on 6/9/99. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 9902163-6 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities, which appear to be minor draft errors creating grammatical and lack of antecedent basis problems.

In the following format (location of objection; suggestion for correction), the following suggestions may overcome their respective objections: (claim 21, line 19, "relative said outer"; inserting - -to- - after "relative") and (claim 21, line 22, "with said rotation"; replacing "said" with - -the- -).

For purposes of examination, the claims have been treated as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2882

3. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perusek et al. (US Patent 4651007) in view of Townsend et al. ("The SMART scanner: a combined PET/CT tomography for clinical oncology)."

4. Regarding claim 29, Perusek et al. discloses a device comprising a gantry (Fig. 2), said gantry comprising an inner (Fig. 2, #240) and outer (Fig. 2, #10) gantry part, a radiation device (Fig. 2, #18), mechanically supported by the inner gantry part and rotatable around a rotation axis (Fig. 6, large arrow next to #112'), wherein all movable parts of the gantry are, in all situations, situated at a distance from the rotation axis larger than a predetermined value (Fig. 2), said inner gantry part being rotatably supported by said outer gantry part at two support locations, situated on opposite sides of the treatment volume in a direction parallel to the axis (Fig. 2, #136), said inner gantry part further comprising a linear beam portion (Fig. 2, #240), on which said radiation device is movably support for motions along said linear beam portion (Fig. 3, right and left arrow), said linear beam portion mechanically connecting said two support locations (Fig. 2, #240 and 136), and said linear beam portion being substantially parallel to said rotation axis (Fig. 2, rotation axis around #16).

However, Perusek et al. does not disclose a radiation head to direct radiation to a treatment volume situated substantially on a rotation axis.

Townsend et al. teaches a radiation head to direct radiation to a treatment volume situated substantially on a rotation axis (Fig. 2, "CT").

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the device of Perusek et al. with the radiation head of

Townsend et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to more accurately acquire aligned functional and anatomical images for any part of the human body (Abstract) as shown by Townsend et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 21-23, 26-28, and 31-39 contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 30 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 21, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest an irradiation device including wherein all movable parts of a gantry are, in all situations, situated at a distance from a rotation axis larger than a predetermined value, an inner gantry part being rotatably supported by an outer gantry part at two support locations, situated on opposite sides of a treatment volume in a direction parallel to said axis, said outer gantry part being stationary with respect to said treatment volume, said radiation head being movable relative to said outer gantry along at least one arc of a circle substantially centered at said treatment volume, said arc being non-parallel with the rotation of a radiation head around said rotation axis, whereby non-coplanar irradiation treatment is achievable, in combination with all the limitations in the claim. Claims 22, 23, 26-28, and 31-39 contain allowable subject matter by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 30, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest an irradiation device including wherein a radiation head is tiltably supported by a linear beam portion, said radiation head directing its radiation towards a treatment volume from any position relative to said linear beam portion, in combination with all the limitations in the claim and base claim.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Townsend et al. still applies for its teachings of a radiation head.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Cheng Glen Kao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2492. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (9 am to 5 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/009,262

Art Unit: 2882

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

glv

DANIDA KENAMINER PRIMARY EXAMINER